DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 012 HE 024 832

AUTHOR Taylor, Robert L.
TITLE Institutional Funding of Higher Education in Australia. AIR 1991 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (31st, San Francisco, CA, May 26-29, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Instruction; *Educational Finance; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; Higher Education; *Models; Research; *Resource Allocation; School Organization; School Support
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; *Australia; Footscray Institute of Technology (Australia)

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the relative funding model developed as part of the reorganization resulting from the 1988 Australian Government's White Paper on Higher Education Policy. This reorganization created the Unified National System which has resulted in fewer but larger higher education institutions. The relative funding model is described in terms of its origins and principles, including: objectivity, simplicity, fairness, relative funding, applicability to total operating grants, relationship to direct costs, teaching and research components, discipline cost clusters, tolerance band, and special factors. The model's teaching and research components are then explained in more detail. Application of the model at the Footscray Institute of Technology (Victoria, Australia) is detailed, including tables using student load as the basis of resource distribution and planned course enrollment as the measure of student load. Includes four references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336012

INSTITUTIONAL FUNDING OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA

Paper Presented at the 31st Annual Forum,
The Association for Institutional Research
San Francisco, California
May 1991

Robert L. Taylor
Planning Officer
F.I.T., Victoria University of Technology
Ballarat Road
Footscray, Victoria. 3011.
AUSTRALIA
+(613)-688.4146

HE 024 832

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AIR
for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-First Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at The Westin St. Francis, San Francisco, California, May 26-29, 1991. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications Editorial
Advisory Committee

INTRODUCTION

Following the 1988 release of the Australian Government's White Paper on Higher Education Policy (Dawkins, J.S. 1988) major changes have occurred in both the fabric and structure of the Higher Education system.

The number of institutions have decreased rapidly as mergers and amalgamations have taken place between previously separate institutions. The binary divide between Colleges of Advanced Education - degree granting institutions with strong vocational emphases - and Universities which were funded for research as well as teaching has been dissolved and the Unified National System has emerged with fewer but larger higher education institutions.

In doing so the Government has had to address the question of funding the new system it has created and the new institutions being formed within it. It has done so in a very public and open manner, presenting for the first time a basis on which funding decisions will be made.

This Paper comprises two parts -

(i) A brief description of the funding model and the premises on which it is based, and

(ii) An explanation of how one institution has used the principles of the model to assist in resource distribution between faculties.

1. THE RELATIVE FUNDING MODEL

In July 1988 the Federal Minister for Employment Education & Training in the Government of Australia released the Government's White Paper on Policy in Higher Education (Dawkins 1988). In that Paper, among other things, the Minister committed the Commonwealth Government to an equalisation of the funding of higher education institutions. In dissolving the previous twenty year binary divide between Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education he stated:

> "Under the Government's arrangements for a unified national system of higher education, institutions will be funded on the basis of merit and achievement rather than historical precedent and arbitrary classification."

There was an important constraint, however, on the process which was that the equalisation of the base funding would not be the vehicle for redistributing research infrastructure funding among institutions. That is, institutions would be funded for "teaching" and "research infrastructure" by separate mechanisms.

Late in 1989 the Government sponsored a national seminar to "test the water" on proposals its education bureaucracy had developed to respond to this initiative and to introduce the relative funding model (RFM).

In opening the seminar the Minister stated:

1/ "Relative funding can only be assessed on what an institution is approved to do.

2/ Relative funding is about relativity between institutions, not about the total size of the higher education dollar.

3/ Relative funding only relates to that student load funded by the Commonwealth. It does not impact on any other fund source.

4/ Relative funding does not pretend to arrive at a precise dollar figure against which all institutions could be assessed.

5/ Relative funding was a national model which would operate at system level only and would have no impact on resource allocation mechanisms within institutions which would remain the responsibility of the institutions themselves." (Dawkins, J.S. 1990)

There was general agreement among seminar participants that any funding model developed should be simple, be minimally intrusive on institutional operational decisions, lead to a more equitable distribution of resources more clearly related to activity, and be applied to operating grants only, with capital and other programs being allocated separately.

It was acknowledged that the model would be used to establish relativities among institutions, not to determine the absolute level of resources needed, and that institutional funding would be evaluated in the context of a band of tolerance rather than in the context of a precise dollar allocation.

There was also general agreement that teaching costs should be differentiated by discipline and course level, and student load weighted accordingly. In its simplest form this can be represented as a two dimensional matrix, using discipline cost as one axis and course level as the second axis. There was a general expectation that the cost factors ultimately used should reflect, as far as possible, real teaching costs and that the differential loadings by course level should not necessarily be a simple multiple of the respective undergraduate costs. It was suggested that a small number of discipline clusters (between four and six) and three or four levels of award would be appropriate.

In June 1990 the Government released its paper "RELATIVE FUNDING MODEL - A draft proposal" (DEET 1990). This proposal, which dealt with the mechanism by which the government would assess whether an institution was under or over funded in its operating grant, was the first attempt by a Commonwealth Government to publicly present a mechanism for considering the relative funding of institutions. It was not an attempt by the Commonwealth to tell institutions how they should spend the money allocated to them, but was a mechanism for proving a benchmark against which their allocations can be measured. The model was built upon the following principles:

* Open and Objective: The relative funding analysis and subsequent allocation process should be open and objective. The model should be explicit in order to ensure that all institutions were aware of their position relative to other institutions.

* Simple: The funding model should be simple rather than detailed and as a consequence should have minimum influence on institutional resource allocation decisions.

* Equitable: The model should be an indicator of the extent to which there is an equitable allocation of operating grants between institutions, to support their agreed educational profiles. Under an equitable system, similar disciplines would be funded at similar levels in all locations and research would be treated in the same way regardless of institution type.

* Relative Funding: The model would be a relative funding model; that is, it would be a model to assess desirable relativities between the operating grant funding of institutions; it would not determine the amount available for the system nor the actual grants to institution. It would not be an absolute funding model.

* Operating Grants: The model would be applied to the total operating grants of institutions.

* Real Costs: The model should relate directly to current patterns of institutional expenditure rather than costs based on ideal inputs, and differentiate reliably between institutions with different educational profiles.

* Teaching and Research Components: The model would comprise a teaching costs component reflecting relative teaching costs, and a separate research related component to reflect research activities and research related infrastructure.

* Discipline Cost Clusters: In meeting with twin demands of having a simple model yet enabling an equitable distribution of operating grants to institutions, there would be a limited number of teaching cost categories into which disciplines of similar cost would be grouped. These cost clusters would be developed so that the degree of dispersion of discipline costs within the clusters would be relatively consistent across the clusters.

* Tolerance Band: The model would not be used as a rigid formula for adjustments to funding of institutions. The variety of institutional circumstances and the potential accuracy of the model necessitated adopting a relatively broad tolerance band in assessing whether institutions were funded appropriately (±3%).

* Special Factors: The model would not attempt to cover institution-specific special factors. It was recognised that some institutions would have special needs but their variety and uniqueness made it virtually impossible to include appropriate formulas in the model and meet the requirement that the model be simple and robust.

MODEL STRUCTURE

The proposed model thus comprised two components:

- a teaching component, and
- a research related component

The teaching component which was approximately 94% of the grant, was based upon student load, costs of which are assumed to vary between disciplines and course level. Disciplines - which are a description of subject content - were considered the appropriate element on which to base a model and it was agreed that the more senior the level of the class the more costly it was to mount.

The model when ultimately released proposed: 5 clusters of disciplines at undergraduate level weighted from 1.0 to 2.7; 3 clusters at postgraduate other than research degree level at 1.4 and 3.0; 2 clusters at research degree level at 2.0 and 4.7. (Baldwin, P. 1990.)

The model also indicated which disciplines would fit into each cluster. (Fig. 1.)

Fig. 1 RELATIVE TEACHING COST MATRIX

Cluster	Discipline Weights		
	Undergraduate	Other Postgraduate	Research Graduate
1	1.0	1.4	2.0
2	1.3		
3	1.6	1.8	
4	2.2	3.0	4.7
5	2.7		

CLUSTER	UNDERGRADUATE	OTHER POSTGRADUATE	HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH
1	Accounting Admin/Economics Law Other Humanities	Accounting Admin/Economics Law Other Humanities Education Maths/Stats Other Social Stud.	Accounting Admin/Economics Computing Education Law Maths/Stats Nursing Other Built Env. Other Health Other Humanities Other Languages Other Social Stud. Visual/Perf.Arts
2	Behavioural Sci. Education Maths/Stats Other Social Stud.		
3	Computing Nursing Other Built. Env. Other Health Other Languages Visual/Perf.Arts	Computing Nursing Other Built Env. Other Health Other Languages Visual/Perf.Arts	
4	Engineering Science Surveying	Agriculture Behavioural Sci. Dentistry Engineering Medicine Science Surveying Vet.Science	Agriculture Behavioural Sci. Dentistry Engineering Medicine Science Surveying Vet.Science
5	Agriculture Dentistry Medicine Vet.Science		

The research related component was to be approximately 6% of the grant based on the relative success of an institution in gaining funding from national research funding authorities by competitive applications.

The proposal, however, recognised that this was not a good indicator and suggested that a mechanism was to be developed which recognised the relative success of an institution in attracting research funds from all sources - both Government and private.

In applying the model for the 1993-1993 triennium several institutions were found to lie outside the tolerance band (±3%) that the model allowed for actual funding. Those institutions received special attention during the annual visits from the educational profile teams and adjustments to their funding and/or student load were made over the planning period to bring them within the tolerance band.

2. THE INSTITUTIONAL EXPERIENCE

The basic outline and the principles upon which the national model of relative funding were developed had, at the time of the introduction of the RFM, been in use within Footscray Institute of Technology (FIT) for several years to facilitate distribution of resources between faculties in the Institute. In this process student load was the basis on which resource distribution was made and planned course enrolment was used as the measure of student load.

The Institute had already developed a simple, but effective, quinquennium student load planning process for its courses and the results of this process led to a table of course enrolments by year, by course, by Department and by Faculty.

This table, however, related to course load and not to teaching department load. In a multi-discipline Institute such as FIT, service teaching into courses by Departments other than that which controls the course is encouraged. A mechanism was developed which distributed the course load for each course across teaching departments according to the nature of the course and the load in each year of the course. This "teaching load distribution" was developed from course accreditation submissions and used the proportion of each course-year taught by each teaching department to distribute the course-year load.

In courses where a relatively fixed course outline exists, typical of science and engineering courses, this was a relatively simple process. In areas such as the arts and business, where more flexible course patterns are allowed, course load distribution was generally based on historical patterns of student enrolment or, where no such history was available, the distribution patterns of similar courses within the Institute. By summing for all courses within the Institute, a teaching load by department (as opposed to a course load by Faculty) was obtained for each Department. This teaching load has, for the past ten years, been the basis of resource distribution between the Faculties.

All teaching undertaken by a Faculty is, however, not of the same nature and is not equally resource intensive. For example, the Faculty of Engineering teaches engineering management subjects which, whilst focused on the engineering profession, are essentially management subjects. Conversely, because of the nature of the Institute's course profile, the Faculty of Business was teaching food science subjects in its Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management.

Therefore, a further step is added to the teaching load distribution - the discipline distribution. In the discipline distribution, the teaching load of each Department is further sub-divided into the nature of that teaching by using the discipline classification of the subjects taught by each Department.

Some Departments are essentially mono-discipline where the majority of their teaching can be properly classified into one discipline category. Others, by their very nature and the nature of the discipline classification system, are responsible for teaching subjects which span many discipline categories. The challenge was to predict the discipline distribution for each Department for the forthcoming year. The process which has been used in the past three years to meet this challenge has relied upon the previous year's actual discipline distribution pro-rated to the anticipated teaching load of each teaching Department for the coming year. This is based on the assumption that the nature of the teaching of any one Department will not alter significantly from one year to the next.

When this process was originally developed national average costs of the various disciplines were converted into weights and applied to the discipline distribution determined above. Currently the externally provided weights of the RFM are used to determine the factors which are applied to the various disciplines. The resource determined by this method is summed for each faculty and a single line budget distributed to each faculty for their operation.

Baldwin, P. Assessment of the Relative Funding position of Australia's Higher Education Institutions. Department of Employment, Education & Training, (Canberra 1990).

Dawkins, J.S. Commonwealth Policy Statement on Higher Education July 1988.

Dawkins, J.S. in Relative Funding in Higher Education - Proceedings of Seminar, Canberra 1989. Department of Employment, Education & Training and the Higher Education Council. Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra. 1990.

DEET Relative Funding Model - A draft proposal Department of Employment, Education & Training and the National Board of Employment, Education & Training, Canberra. June 1990.

D.E.E.T.
****

QUINQUENNIUM MASTER PLAN
FACULTY OF BUSINESS 1992 - 4 BASE PLAN DRAFT 3

CONT=CONTINUING COMM=COMMENCING	CONT/RET RATE	1991 TOT	1992 CONT	1992 COMM	1992 TOT	1993 CONT	1993 COMM	1993 TOT	1994 CONT	1994 COMM	1994 TOT	1995 CONT	1995 COMM	1995 TOT	1996 CONT	1996 COMM	1996 TOT
ACCOUNTING YR1	0.19	152	29	123	152	29	123	152	29	123	152	29	123	152	29	123	152
ACCOUNTING YR2	0.85	151	129		129	129		129	129		129	129		129	129		129
ACCOUNTING YR3	0.70	62	106		106	90		90	90		90	90		90	90		90
ACCOUNTING YR4	1.20	109	75		75	127		127	108		108	108		108	108		108
BANK & FINAN YR1	0.12	52	6	41	47	6	41	47	6	41	47	6	41	47	6	41	47
BANK & FINAN YR2	0.69	38	36		36	33		33	32		32	32		32	32		32
BANK & FINAN YR3	0.65	15	25		25	23		23	21		21	21		21	21		21
BANK & FINAN YR4	1.20	49	18		18	30		30	28		28	25		25	25		25
GRAD CERT/DIP ACCT	0.47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M.BUS.ACCT & FIN YR5	0.00	16	0	6	6	0	6	6	0	6	6	0	6	6	0	6	6
M.BUS.ACCT & FIN YR6	0.75	3	12		12	5		5	5		5	5		5	5		5
ACCOUNTANCY & LAW		648	436	170	606	471	170	641	448	170	618	445	170	615	445	170	615
RETAIL MANAG YR1	0.05	38	2	47	49	2	47	49	2	47	49	2	47	49	2	47	49
RETAIL MANAG YR2	0.65	44	25		25	32		32	32		32	32		32	32		32
RETAIL MANAG YR3	0.70	22	31		31	17		17	22		22	22		22	23		23
RETAIL MANAG YR4	1.12	36	24		24	35		35	19		19	25		25	25		25
INF TECHNOLOGY YR1	0.04	38	2	49	51	2	49	51	2	49	51	2	49	51	2	49	51
INF TECHNOLOGY YR2	0.56	37	21		21	28		28	29		29	29		29	29		29
INF TECHNOLOGY YR3	0.60	28	22		22	13		13	17		17	17		17	17		17
INF TECHNOLOGY YR4	1.00	3	28		28	22		22	13		13	17		17	17		17
INTERN'L TRADE YR1	0.05	38	2	40	42	2	40	42	2	40	42	2	40	42	2	40	42
INTERN'L TRADE YR2	0.73	38	28		28	31		31	31		31	31		31	31		31
INTERN'L TRADE YR3	0.77		29		29	22		22	24		24	24		24	24		24
INTERN'L TRADE YR4	1.32		0		0	39		39	28		28	31		31	31		31
G.D. IND REL/H.R.M.	0.29	29	8	11	19	6	11	17	5	11	16	5	11	16	5	11	16
G.D.COMPUTING	0.40	15	6	10	16	6	10	16	7	10	17	7	10	17	7	10	17
M.BUS. I.R./HRM YR5	0.00	5	0	5	5	0	5	5	0	5	5	0	5	5	0	5	5
M.BUS. I.R./HRM YR5	0.75		4		4	4		4	4		4	4		4	4		4
APPLIED ECONOMICS		373	234	162	396	261	162	423	237	162	399	249	162	411	250	162	412
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR1	0.03	110	3	101	104	3	101	104	3	101	104	3	101	104	3	101	104
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR2	0.74	96	81		81	77		77	77		77	77		77	77		77
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR3	0.81	60	78		78	66		66	63		63	62		62	62		62
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR4	1.22	80	73		73	95		95	80		80	76		76	76		76
TOURISM MANAG YR1	0.09	54	5	50	55	5	49	54	5	49	54	5	49	54	5	49	54
TOURISM MANAG YR2	0.83	40	45		45	46		46	45		45	45		45	45		45
TOURISM MANAG YR3	0.82	39	33		33	37		37	37		37	37		37	37		37
TOURISM MANAG YR4	1.05	50	41		41	34		34	38		38	39		39	39		39
GRAD.DIP HOSP/TOUR	0.36	13	5	6	11	4	6	10	4	6	10	3	6	9	3	6	9
G.D.HOSP/TOUR F/T	0.01	11	0	16	16	0	16	16	0	16	16	0	16	16	0	16	16
G.D. HOSP.MANAGEMENT	0.00			10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10
M.BUS.HOSP.MAN.YR6	0.75						8	8		8	8		8	8		8	8
HOSP & TOUR MANAG		551	362	183	545	366	190	556	352	190	541	348	190	537	347	190	537
M.BUS.TOUR.DEV. YR5	0.00	4	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10
M.BUS.TOUR.DEV. YR6	0.75	4	3		3	8		8	8		8	8		8	8		8
MBA/DOCTORATE YR5	0.00			6	6	0	26	26	0	26	26	0	26	26	0	26	26
MBA/DOCTORATE YR6	0.75				0	5		5	20		20	20		20	20		20
FACULTY C WORK		8	3	16	19	12	36	48	27	36	63	27	36	63	27	36	63
RESEARCH STUDENTS F.O.S. BUSINESS	0.75	5	3	4	7	6	4	10	7	4	11	8	4	12	9	4	13
FACULTY OF BUSINESS		1585	1038	535	1573	1116	562	1677	1071	562	1633	1078	562	1639	1078	562	1640

DRAFT 1 1992

THE DIRECTORATE
1992 STUDENT LOAD DISTRIBUTION MODEL-GOVT FUNDED STUDENTS

ACCOUNTANCY & LAW	AL	AE	HA	BS	CE	EE	ME	EN	CM	MA	PH	NU	AS	HU	PE	TE	GS	TOTAL
ACCT. YR.1	78.82	71.76	1.26															152
ACCT. YR.2	79.00	35.95	13.00											1.00				129
ACCT. YR.3				105.56														106
ACCT. YR.4	52.55	18.05	4.04															75
BANK&FINAN YR1	17.73	23.64	5.91															47
BANK&FINAN YR2	14.06	15.02	6.00											1.00				36
BANK&FINAN YR3				24.96														25
BANK&FINAN YR4	12.58	4.29	0.96															18
GRAD.DIP.ACCT.	0.12	0.02	0.00															0
MAST ACC & FINAN YR5	5.16	0.67	0.17															6
MAST ACC & FINAN YR6	12.38																	12
TOTAL	272.26	169.40	31.42	130.52										2.00				606
APPLIED ECONOMICS																		
RETAIL MANAG YEAR1	18.34	30.57																49
RETAIL MANAG YEAR2	7.18	11.06	5.58											1.00				25
RETAIL MANAG YEAR3				31.01														31
RETAIL MANAG YEAR4		18.23	6.08															24
INF TECHNOLOGY YR1	18.95	31.58																51
INF TECHNOLOGY YR2	3.62	13.76	3.81											1.00				21
INF TECHNOLOGY YR3	3.79	14.55	3.79															22
INF TECHNOLOGY YR4		28.48																28
INT'L TRADE YEAR1	10.48	26.20	5.24															42
INT'L TRADE YEAR2	4.74	18.35	3.95											1.00				28
INT'L TRADE YEAR3	5.85	19.30	5.85															29
INT'L TRADE YEAR4																		19
G.D. COMPUTING	0.64	10.77																16
INDUSTRIAL RELAT'N & M	2.02	12.12	2.02															5
MAST I.R./H.R.M.YR5	0.63	3.75	0.63															4
MAST I.R./H.R.M.YR6		3.98																
TOTAL	75.43	250.70	35.35	31.01										3.00				396
HOSP & TOURISM MANAG																		
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR1	23.17	34.76	46.35															104
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR2	10.80	10.80	54.42											5.00				81
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR3				77.84														78
CAT&HOTEL MANAG YR4	11.84	2.73	58.27															73
TOURISM MANAG YR1	27.42	13.71	13.71															55
TOURISM MANAG YR2	0.56	11.70	27.31											5.00				45
TOURISM MANAG YR3				32.55														33
TOURISM MANAG YR4	1.52	1.52	37.49															41
HOSP/TOURISM PG1			10.75															11
HOSP/TOURISM P/T			16.11															16
G.D.HOSP.MANAGEMENT																		10
M.BUS.HOSP.MAN.YR6																		
TOTAL	75.31	75.22	264.41	110.40										10.00				545.34
TOURISM DEV YR5	3.33	3.33	3.33															10
TOURISM DEV YR6			2.85															3
DOCTORATE YR 5				6.00														6
DOCTORATE YR 6																		
RESEARCH DEGREES				7.38														7
	3.33	3.33	6.18	13.38														26
FACULTY OF BUSINESS	426.33	498.66	337.37	285.30										15.00				1573

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE DIRECTORATE
REPORT TO DEANS OF FACULTY/POLICY & RESOURCES
EQUIVALENT FULL TIME STUDENT UNITS SEMESTER 1 1991
INSTITUTE SUMMARY

	AL	AE	HA	BS	CE	EE	ME	CM	MA	PH	NU	HU	PE	TE	DT	TOTAL
ENGLISH												17.04				17.04
HISTORY								1.23				18.38	0.49			20.02
PHILOSOPHY													7.17			7.17
ETHNIC/AREA STUDIES												59.03	0.34		9.38	68.75
LANG S NOT ENGLISH												31.44		2.53		33.97
COMMUNICATION STUDIES												13.18	11.69		12.61	37.48
OTHER HUMANITIES																
BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES			33.31								0.78	21.53	17.87			73.41
GEOGRAPHY												13.06				13.06
WELFARE,COUNSELLING																
SPORT & RECREATION													97.82	2.46		100.28
POLITICAL SCIENCE,GOVERNMENT					0.06							5.50				5.56
SOCIOLOGY												38.04	3.96	3.54		46.34
EDUCATION STUDIES														53.14		53.14
TEACHING PRACTICE														35.00		35.00
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES								49.62		1.62			18.36			69.60
EARTH SCIENCES					5.58											5.58
PHYSICAL/MATERIALS SCIENCES					8.44		1.43			53.72			5.81		4.85	66.25
CHEMICAL SCIENCES			36.13					51.54							4.85	92.52
OTHER SCIENCES								0.71		1.18			1.46	3.46		6.73
MATHEMATICS,STATISTICS		52.93					1.01		158.84			8.85		2.46	12.05	219.31
COMP-BASED INFO SCIENCE	1.11	14.79			6.66	4.57	1.01		50.99					0.02	6.45	105.60
COMPUTER SCIENCE		5.89				4.86			17.97							27.92
OTHER MATHEMATICS,COMPUTING		44.77							1.25	0.67		2.59				49.28
ART													1.98			1.98
PERFORMING ARTS												8.08	18.58			18.66
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING					0.85											0.85
CIVIL,STRUCTURAL ENG					76.34											76.34
ELEC,ELECT,COMP COMM ENG						126.22				8.41						134.63
MECHANICAL,AUTO ENG					3.67	8.60	48.22									52.49
INDUSTRIAL,PROCESS ENG									3.71							3.71
GENERAL ENGINEERING					1.46		0.52									1.98
OTHER ENGINEERING					1.19											1.19
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY																
THERAPIES,THER TECHNOLOGIES																
NURSING											140.79	2.97				143.76
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH								4.36								4.36
MEDICINE,MEDICAL SCIENCE																
COMM/FAMILY/PERS HEALTH CARE											13.12		3.19			16.31
OTHER HEALTH SCIENCES			1.96										2.72	2.48		7.16
ECONOMICS		122.29							6.97			2.64				131.90
ACCOUNTING	220.17															220.17
COMMERCE,SALES,SERVICE	0.24	15.26	51.22		2.06				5.27						9.81	83.86
MANAGEMENT,ADMINISTRATION		10.80	60.96		1.68							1.47	9.85			83.96
LAW,JUSTICE,LEGAL STUDIES	60.61				1.15											61.76
OTHER ADMIN,BUS,ECO,LAW	49.78		0.12													49.90
COOPERATIVE YEAR				109.61												109.61
ENVIRONMENTAL/PRODUCT DESIGN												18.67				18.67
BUILDING,CONSTRUCTION					16.74											16.74
SURVEYING					8.86											8.86
UNDERGRADUATE	331.91	286.70	183.70	109.61	126.74	135.45	52.19	107.46	236.20	65.52	154.61	246.31	208.49	105.17	60.80	2402.86

CHECK SUM 2402.86

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANTICIPATED STUDENT LOAD DISTRIBUTION 1992

	AL	AE	HA	BS	CE	EE	ME	EN	CM	MA	PH	NU	AS	HU	PE	TE	GS TOTAL
PLANNED LOAD	514	536	391	256	252	259	104		192	424	135	404		524	401	220	4613
ENGLISH														36			36
HISTORY									2					39	1		42
PHILOSOPHY															14		14
ETHNIC/AREA STUDIES														126	1		126
LANG'S NOT ENGLISH														67		5	72
COMMUNICATION STUDIES														28	23		51
OTHER HUMANITIES																	
BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES			71									2		46	36		154
GEOGRAPHY														28			28
WELFARE,COUNSELLING																	
SPORT & RECREATION															196	5	201
POLITICAL SCIENCE,GOVERNMENT					0									12			12
SOCIOLOGY														83	8	7	98
EDUCATION STUDIES																111	111
TEACHING PRACTICE																73	73
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES									89		3				37		129
EARTH SCIENCES					11												11
PHYSICAL/MATERIALS SCIENCES					1		3				111				12		126
CHEMICAL SCIENCES			77						92								169
OTHER SCIENCES									1		2				3	7	14
MATHEMATICS,STATISTICS		99					2			269				8		5	376
COMP-BASED INFO SCIENCE	2	65			13	9	2			92						0	182
COMPUTER SCIENCE		11				8				32							51
OTHER MATHEMATICS,COMPUTING		84								2	1			6			93
ART															4		4
PERFORMING ARTS														0	37		37
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING					2												2
CIVIL,STRUCTURAL ENG					152												152
ELEC,ELECT,COMP COMM ENG						241					17						258
MECHANICAL,AUTO ENG					7	1	96										105
INDUSTRIAL,PROCESS ENG										7							7
GENERAL ENGINEERING					3		1										4
OTHER ENGINEERING					2												2
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY																	
THERAPIES,THER TECHNOLOGIES												368		6			374
NURSING									8								8
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH																	
MEDICINE,MEDICAL SCIENCE												34			6		41
COMM/FAMILY/PERS HEALTH CARE															5	5	15
OTHER HEALTH SCIENCES			4							13				6			247
ECONOMICS		229															342
ACCOUNTING	342									9							151
COMMERCE,SALES,SERVICE	0	29	109		4									3	18		175
MANAGEMENT,ADMINISTRATION		28	130		3												96
LAW,JUSTICE,LEGAL STUDIES	94				2												78
OTHER ADMIN,BUS,ECO,LAW	77		0														256
COOPERATIVE YEAR				256										40			40
ENVIRONMENTAL/PRODUCT DESIGN																	33
BUILDING,CONSTRUCTION					33												18
SURVEYING					18												
UNDERGRADUATE	515	537	391	256	252	259	104		192	424	135	404		524	401	220	4614
																CHECK SUM	4614

PROJECTED W.E.F.T.S.U. DISTRIBUTION 1992

		AL	AE	MA	BS	CE	EE	ME	EN	CM	MA	PH	NU	AS	HU	PE	TE	GS	TOTAL
ENGLISH	1.0														36				36
HISTORY	1.0									2					39	1 .			42
PHILOSOPHY	1.0															14			14
ETHNIC/AREA STUDIES	1.0														126	1			126
LANG'S NOT ENGLISH	1.6														107		8		115
COMMUNICATION STUDIES	1.0														28	23			51
OTHER HUMANITIES	1.0																		
BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES	1.3			92									2		60	46			201
GEOGRAPHY	1.3														36				36
WELFARE,COUNSELLING	1.3															254	7		261
SPORT & RECREATION	1.3														15				15
POLITICAL SCIENCE,GOVERNMENT	1.3					8									107	10	10		127
SOCIOLOGY	1.3																145		145
EDUCATION STUDIES	1.3																95		95
TEACHING PRACTICE	1.3									195		7				81			283
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	2.2					24													24
EARTH SCIENCES	2.2					2		6				244				26			278
PHYSICAL/MATERIALS SCIENCES	2.2			169						203									372
CHEMICAL SCIENCES	2.2									3		5				6	16		30
OTHER SCIENCES	2.2														0		7		488
MATHEMATICS,STATISTICS	1.3		129					3			358						0		292
COMP-BASED INFO SCIENCE	1.6	3	104			21	14	3			146								82
COMPUTER SCIENCE	1.6		18				12				52								121
OTHER MATHEMATICS,COMPUTING	1.3		109								3	2			7				6
ART	1.6															6			60
PERFORMING ARTS	1.6														0	59			4
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	2.2					4													335
CIVIL,STRUCTURAL ENG	2.2					335													568
ELEC,ELECT,COMP COMM ENG	2.2						530					38							231
MECHANICAL,AUTO ENG	2.2					16	3	212											15
INDUSTRIAL,PROCESS ENG	2.2										15								9
GENERAL ENGINEERING	2.2					6		2											5
OTHER ENGINEERING	2.2					5													
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	1.6																		
THERAPIES,THER TECHNOLOGIES	1.6												589		10				599
NURSING	1.6									12									12
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	1.6																		
MEDICINE,MEDICAL SCIENCE	2.7												55			10			65
COMM/FAMILY/PERS HEALTH CARE	1.6															9	8		24
OTHER HEALTH SCIENCES	1.6			7															247
ECONOMICS	1.0		229								13				6				342
ACCOUNTING	1.0	342																	151
COMMERCE,SALES,SERVICE	1.0	0	29	109		4					9								175
MANAGEMENT,ADMINISTRATION	1.0		20	138		3									1	10			96
LAW,JUSTICE,LEGAL STUDIES	1.0	94				2													78
OTHER ADMIN,BUS,ECO,LAW	1.0	77		0															51
COOPERATIVE YEAR	0.2				51										64				64
ENVIRONMENTAL/PRODUCT DESIGN	1.6					53													53
BUILDING,CONSTRUCTION	1.6					39													39
SURVEYING	2.2																		
UNDERGRADUATE		516	637	507	51	516	559	226		415	588	297	646		644	566	296		6463
AVERAGE WEIGHT		1.00	1.19	1.30	0.20	2.04	2.16	2.17		2.16	1.39	2.19	1.60		1.23	1.41	1.34		1.40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE